PA
6537
R11

A

0
0
1
4
1
0
5
9
7
7

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

PA
6537
R11

With the complement of two

Extracted from *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. LI, 1920.

XI. — *The Juvenile Works of Ovid and the Spondaic Period of His Metrical Art*¹

BY PROFESSOR ROBERT S. RADFORD

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

I. Introduction. Ovid and the Messalla Collection

IN his chapter on famous orators, Quintilian aptly observes that, for later generations, Cicero had become not so much the name of a person as the designation of the art of oratory. We may apply a similar remark to the Latin poet Ovid. To students of Roman literature Ovid means the perfected elegiac art, the supreme mastery of the technical side of Latin verse, to which he contributed an unparalleled elegance and grace. Yet it is certain that he was also a person, and we know more of the actual details of his life than of the life of any other Roman, with the single exception of Cicero. Every schoolboy is familiar with the charming picture which he has given in the *Tristia* of his early devotion to the Muses, in spite of the remonstrances of his father and the arguments which the latter urged against unprofitable literary pursuits.

¹ Bibliography: — Hultgren, *Observationes metr. in poetas elegiacos Gr. et Lat.*, Leipzig, 1871; Köne, *Sprache der röm. Epiker*, Münster, 1840; Radford, "Licensed Feet in Latin Verse," *Studies in Honor of Maurice Bloomfield* (New Haven, 1920), 251-272; O. F. Gruppe, *Röm. Elegie*, Leipzig, 1838; Klee-
mann, *De libri tertii carminibus quae Tibulli nom. circumferuntur*, Strassburg, 1876; Teuffel, *Studien u. Charakteristiken*, Leipzig, 1871; Fuss, *De elegiarum libro quem Lygdami esse putant quidam*, Münster, 1867; Krafft, *De artibus quas Tib. et Lygd. in versibus concinnandis adhibuerunt*, Halle, 1874; Paroli, *De Tib. arte metr. cum Lygd. comparata*, Brescia, 1899; Hartung, *De panegyrico ad Messallam pseudo-Tib.*, Halle, 1880; Ehrengrubner, *De panegyri Messallae pseudo-Tib., partes I-X*, Kremsmünster, 1889-1899; Knappe, *De Tib. libri quarti elegiis*, Dudstadt, 1880; Némethy, *Albii Tibulli carmina*, etc., Budapest, 1905; *Lygdami carmina*, Budapest, 1906; K. F. Smith, *Elegies of Tibullus*, New York, 1913; Burman, *Ovidii opera omnia*, Amsterdam, 1756, with Index Verborum; Eschenburg, *Wie hat Ovid einzelne Wörter u. Wortklassen im Verse verwandt?*, Lübeck, 1886; H. de la Ville de Mirmont, "Le poète Lygdamus," *Musée Belge*, VIII (1904), 339-403; Plessis, *La poésie latine* (Paris, 1909), 361-376; Schanz, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.* II³, I, 232 ff.; Ullrich, *Studia Tib.: De libri II editione*, Berlin, 1880.

273432

GIFT OF F. M. Carey AUG 2 1937 JAN 1 1938

He was one of the most precocious of Roman poets, and like Cowley or like Pope he "lisped in numbers, for the numbers came."² According to his own account, when he first recited his juvenile poems to a public audience, his "beard had been shaved only once or twice."³ This plain statement is usually misinterpreted, but clearly the natural meaning is that when he first entered the circle of his patron, Messalla, he was only fifteen or sixteen years of age.⁴ Beginning to write at so early a period, when the simpler and more natural school of Catullus, Gallus, and Propertius was still in the ascendant, Ovid passed through a long period of apprenticeship and, after much wavering and much experimentation, eventually abandoned the more natural manner with which he had begun, and went over wholly to the more artistic and more epigrammatic style of Tibullus, which he found better suited to his own rhetorical training and to which he finally gave an undisputed supremacy in the domain of Roman elegy. It is true that a different opinion is usually held today, and it is everywhere assumed that he devoted himself from the first to the imitation of Tibullus and possessed from the beginning the remarkable facility and skill which make him easily the first of Roman metrical artists. This view seems to me wholly erroneous, and I shall begin in the present study to trace the various stages by which Ovid, the historical person, the friend of Messalla, the disciple first of Catullus and later of Tibullus, reached the acme of artistic perfection.

As is well known, the poet Ovid possessed brilliant powers of description, and was both a natural story-teller and a

² *Sponte sua carmen numeros veniebat ad aptos,*

Et quod temptabam scribere in prose, versus erat. — *Trist.* iv, 10, 2.

³ *Ib.* 57.

⁴ There was no definite time fixed for the *depositio barbae*, but it usually coincided with the assumption of the *toga virilis* (Suet. *Calig.* 10). Most writers incorrectly make this statement refer to Ovid's twentieth or twenty-second year, as Schanz, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.* 11², 1, § 203; J. Heuwers, *De temporibus quo Ovidii Amores conscripti sint* (Münster, 1883), 14; Crutwell, *Rom. Lit.* 360, etc.

highly trained rhetorician. He is noted for his "swift lightness of touch," his brief, snappy sentences, his sharp contrasts, and his terse and highly polished epigrams (cf. K. F. Smith, *op. cit.* Intro. 103 ff.). Since we seek, however, to trace an actual historical development, it may be worth while to return for a moment to 'Ovid' in the meaning of the perfected art of elegy, and to picture clearly the numerous refinements which his finished technique embraces.

— These rules include the breaking up of the long sentence and the restriction of the thought to a single distich, the avoidance of elision, especially in the latter half of both the hexameter and the pentameter, the marked preference given in the hexameter to the favorite masculine caesura (the *semi-quinaria*), the ending of the pentameter with a dissyllable, which should not be an adjective, but either a noun or a verb, and above all the preponderance of dactyls in the distich in direct opposition to the original and native character of the language. Through the observance of these complex requirements the elegiac couplet gains an incomparable elegance and precision, at the same moment that it loses its larger variety, freedom, and ease. Tibullus himself had narrowed the sphere of Roman elegy by rejecting the natural period and restricting the thought within the minimum space of two lines. This limitation, which is unknown to Catullus and Propertius, is undoubtedly a serious mistake, and it finds little justification of any kind in the previous history of the elegy. Yet, although he gave an artificial form to the distich, Tibullus, through the expression of simple and natural emotion, invariably retained its proper content, and he could not foresee perhaps that the more brilliant but more wayward Ovid would too often, through the absence of sincere and genuine feeling, merge the elegy in the epigram and make both form and content unduly artificial. Both Tibullus and Ovid then were consummate artists, but both yielded too much to the prevailing tendency of the Augustan age in restricting the liberty and the spontaneity of their

verse. Tibullus is excessively rhetorical in form, Ovid is excessively rhetorical in both form and thought. (See also some just observations in Sellar, *Horace and the Elegiac Poets*, 307.)

Even more characteristic of our poet, however, than the unity of the distich and the *tyrannis* of the dissyllabic close is the dactylic preponderance. We may say that Ovid is the poet, *par excellence*, of the dactylic virtuosity, which appears alike in his epic and his elegiac verse. While the Greek language is twice as rich in dactyls as in spondees,⁵ in Latin this relation is reversed, and the Roman language has almost twice as many spondees as dactyls. In all the other poets of Rome (with the exception only of Valerius Flaccus and a few genuine elegies of Tibullus' second book) the spondees considerably exceed the dactyls; Ovid alone has known — like the Medea or the Circe of his own exuberant fancy — how to transform, by the magic of his art, the slow but stately spondees of his native speech into the light and graceful dactyls of Hellenic verse. Through this supreme refinement he has brought to fulfillment the mission which Ennius, the hardy pioneer, had vaguely dreamed of nearly two centuries before, and has banished from Latium the last trace of Italian rusticity (cf. Hor. *Epist.* II. 1, 160). He is the greatest artist in verse that Rome produced, the supreme master both in the elegy and in the epos. It is no wonder then that Lucian Müller exclaims in ecstatic admiration (*De re metrica*², 522): “Hunc igitur virum, qui principatum haud dubie tenet artis Latinae, veneremur, hunc imitemur. hic sciat se plurimum profecisse, cui plurimum probetur Ovidius. huius quot sunt versus, totidem sunt artificia, quovis Phidiae illa vel Praxitelis opere non minora.”⁶ Our chief metrical scholars have carried their worship and adoration so far that they have ended by creating a veritable ‘Ovid myth.’ Ovid is Rome’s one white

⁵ Hultgren, *op. cit.* 8; Köne, *op. cit.* 5 ff.

⁶ See also *ib.* 70; Gleditsch, *Metrik*, § 152, 7; Hultgren, *op. cit.* 35, and *Jahrbuch f. class. Phil.* XIX (1873), 752.

crow and he was always white. His art is free from the trammels of place and time, and knows no process of growth, no stage of development, but the Fates conferred upon the divine man⁷ at his birth a faculty that was miraculously complete. Hence Lucian Müller, *op. cit.* 346, pronounces a passage in the *Amores*, which contains several elisions, interpolated, and declares those Epistles of the Heroines, which show one or two polysyllabic closes, to be spurious (*ib.* 29 ff., 259). Hultgren, *op. cit.* 26 ff., insists that the comparative lack of virtuosity in the *de Medicamine* fragment is not the result of immature art, but of pure accident, and asserts that to attribute to Ovid any work actually lacking the virtuosity would be to "place the head of Thersites upon the body of Agamemnon" (*ib.* 32). Ehrenguber, who has computed or collected the percentages of so many Latin poets, announces the rule that each author has his definite dactylic proportion from which he never greatly departs (*op. cit.* X, 12 ff.). Even such a master of statistics as Drobisch, when he acutely observes that "the *Amores* of Ovid, especially in the hexameter, fall short by a little more than 2% of the virtuosity attained in the *Ars*" (*Ber. sächs. Gesellschaft.* XXIII [1871], 33), does not seem to have grasped the full truth; for he apparently thought of the decline in the virtuosity as evenly distributed over the entire *Amores*. In point of fact, nothing could be more erroneous than these views. Thus Quintilian, IX, 3, 70, had before him a collection of Ovidian epigrams quite similar to the *Priapea* and containing rather frequent polysyllabic closes; he actually quotes the line, Cur ego non dicam, Fūria, te fūriam?

In order to determine the whole question definitely, I have carefully examined the three books of the *Amores* which we now possess and which were not published before 2 B.C., when the poet was forty-one. It is well known that there was an earlier edition in five books, published in 14 B.C., when the poet was already twenty-nine. According to my

⁷ Cf. Cic. *Arch.* 7, 16: hunc divinum hominem, Africanum.

results, nearly one-fourth of the poems in our present *Amores* have been retained from the first edition with little change, and still show the original spondaic form which they possessed at their first publication. The mature works of Ovid, such as the *Ars*, show 57% of dactyls in the distich, while the first edition of the *Amores*, according to my reconstruction, did not greatly exceed 48.5%. The remaining three-fourths of our present edition consists of poems which have either been fully revised or newly written, and if the spondaic fourth be subtracted, their percentage rises to more than 56%. In other words, the remaining poems show practically the same virtuosity as the mature works. In the second section of this paper I shall exhibit these results more fully and in tabular form. It is evident therefore that Ovid first composed in spondees, which is precisely what we should expect on a priori grounds. For, Latin being a highly spondaic language, it seems just about as possible for a youthful poet to lisp in Chinese or in Choctaw as in Latin dactyls. We may go further, however, and assert that even if Ovid, on his first appearance in 27 B.C., had possessed all the miraculous gifts with which he has been credited, he would not have actually composed in dactyls. It is true that even at this early date Tibullus was highly esteemed,⁸ yet the memory of the free republic was still cherished, and the more natural school of Catullus was still preferred. Hence, in all probability, even if the youthful Ovid had possessed the dactylic faculty, he would have lacked the will to virtuosity, since the latter implies also a willingness to sacrifice the larger perspicuity of expression and the normal descriptive word orders. Furthermore, two of the three highly dactylic elegies of Tibullus' second book were not composed until 22 B.C., five years later, as is shown by their imitation of Propertius (Némethy, *op. cit.* 338).

The importance of the reconstruction of the first edition

⁸ . . . Legiturque Tibullus

Et placet, et iam *tertio* Augusto *principio* notus erat. — *Trist.* II, 464.

of the *Amores* and of the consequent recovery of the youthful or 'spondaic' Ovid cannot easily be overestimated. Freed from fanciful and unwarranted presuppositions, we are at liberty to restore the actual, historical Ovid, and we shall be able to show in the sequel, as I believe, that this great artistic genius, beginning, just like Catullus, with simple nature and therefore in some cases with only 37% of dactyls in the distich, has made in less than twenty years an unparalleled development in his art, and, by veritably creating a new language, such as Ennius and his eager successors achieved only in part, has been able, in the works of his full maturity, composed after the age of thirty-five, to rise to 57% of dactyls in the distich. I do not seek, however, to reconstruct the spondaic period of Ovid's art for a purely theoretical purpose nor with the aim of contrasting in an abstract manner the first *Amores* with all the remaining works; I wish rather to restore the poet's early life, and partly by following in the footsteps of eminent critics, such as Gruppe, Plessis, Klee-mann, Ehrenguber, Ribbeck, Marx, Schanz, and Cartault, partly by completing and enlarging their work, I hope to endow him with an appropriate set of spondaic works. These juvenile works are, from the Appendix Vergiliana, at least *Catulepton*, ix, and from the Corpus Tibullianum the whole of the Messalla Collection as well as two of the six elegies contained in Tibullus' second or posthumous book. The proper discussion of these poems naturally requires a series of articles. In the present study I shall deal only with the metrical development, while in several articles to be published shortly in the *American Journal of Philology*, I shall examine in detail, with the help of Burman's much neglected Index, the language of the juvenile poems in relation to Ovid's mature works and also sketch more fully the history of the controversy which has raged for more than a century among critics over the authorship and value of the Messalla Collection.⁹

⁹ So far as concerns the Lygdamus elegies, a most just and admirable account of the controversy is given by H. de la Ville de Mirmont, *op. cit.* 339-

A briefer outline, however, of the various opinions of scholars cannot be wholly omitted here, especially as the controversy over the Lygdamus poems constitutes one of the most amazing chapters in the whole history of literary criticism. I may begin with the so-called Messalla Collection. This latter is a collection of famous poems emanating from the household of the great Augustan statesman, Valerius Messalla. In our fourteenth-century codices it forms a single book, added to the unfinished second book of Tibullus and apparently published, like the posthumous second book, in 19 B.C. The Italian scholars of the fifteenth century have wrongly divided this additional book into two, the so-called third and fourth books of Tibullus, and for the purpose of avoiding confusion it seems best to retain this division. (Probably, as all the mediaeval citations show, there were originally only 'two books of Tibullus,' and the second book of 1111 verses was first divided at the close of the Middle Ages into the second and third books which our late codices exhibit; see Ullrich, *op. cit.* 69.) In the six elegies of the third book a youth apparently of eighteen or nineteen, yet already famous as a poet and employing the pseudonym of Lygdamus, seeks to win back the love of the fair Neaera, who has divorced him. It is probable, too, that he has given cause for the divorce, though naturally this is not admitted and he pleads a difficult case with wonderful facility. Although the poems of unhappy love easily admit of being turned to ridicule by an unfair critic like Voss, I know of no juster criticism upon them than that of Teuffel, written in mature life and before he (like Dissen) had lent an ear to the slanders of Voss: "These elegies, through the freshness and sincerity of the feeling and the graceful ease of the verse, do their author no discredit."¹⁰ As is well known, Lygdamus

403. Although the author does not fully understand the real issues, I wish to acknowledge my deep indebtedness to the historical part of this fine study.

¹⁰ Quoted by Kleemann, *op. cit.* 17, from Pauly's *Realencyclopædie*, VI, 2, 1950 (1852).

tells us the exact date of his birth (5, 18). "My parents first beheld my birthday," he says, "in the year in which both the consuls met an equal fate" (*cum cecidit fato consul uterque pari*) — he means in 43 B.C., when Hirtius and Pansa were both slain in battle before Mutina. Now precisely the same pentameter (*cum cecidit*, etc.) is used by Ovid, *Trist.* IV, 10, 6, to give his own birth-date of 43 B.C. The Renaissance editors, Scaliger and Vulpius, perhaps attached less importance to the dozen or more whole lines and half-lines which Ovid and Lygdamus have in common, and the numerous other amazing coincidences, but they knew well that, in the case of different poets, the date of birth and the birth-line cannot be borrowed. Wishing therefore to preserve the third book for Tibullus and to prevent it from being assigned to Ovid, they pronounced the birth-line an interpolation from the *Tristia* and bracketed the whole distich. The same procedure was followed later by Broukhuisen (1708), Wunderlich (1817), Bährens (1876), and Ramsay (1887).

Matters remained in this state until the German peasant poet of Mecklenburg and the great classical translator, Johann Heinrich Voss, appeared upon the scene (1810). Voss's works abound in homely and realistic scenes of village and country life, and his idyl, *Luise*, published in 1795, furnished Goethe with a model for *Hermann und Dorothea*. He was naturally much attracted by the simple pastoral elegy of Tibullus, and when he came, in the third book, to the poems of Lygdamus with their brilliant pictures of elegance and wealth, he saw at once that this courtly city poet could not possibly be Tibullus. He therefore removed the name of Tibullus from the third book and substituted that of Lygdamus. So far he showed himself an excellent critic, but he did not stop here. He poured forth against the romanticist masquerading under the name of the unworldly Tibullus a torrent of vituperation and of coarse abuse that is well-nigh incredible, and that many of our editors of Tibullus and many of our orthodox historians of Roman literature have ever since repeated in the

most credulous or most servile fashion, but naturally in language somewhat more decorous and more restrained.¹¹ Although Voss never possessed any great vogue in Germany at large as a critic, his authority among classical philologists was immense, and it is chiefly to his violent attack upon the Lygdamus elegies that we must ascribe the hopeless confusion that has since arisen among scholars and that has made the question of the authorship of these poems an insoluble 'mystery.' A part of the responsibility for the entanglement belongs, however, to W. Hertzberg, the well-known editor of Propertius. He also was possessed of great authority in his day, although his conclusions were usually hasty and Plessis, *Études sur Properce*, 80, charges him with an "incurable recklessness" (*une incurable légèreté*). Otto Friedrich Gruppe, a critic of the first order, had just published his standard work, *Die römische Elegie* (1838). In a brilliant and forceful chapter of this book (pp. 105-143) he confidently identifies Lygdamus with Ovid and Neaera with Ovid's second wife, the "blameless spouse" of the *Tristia*, IV, 10, 71, who did not, however, long remain married to the poet. Hertzberg at once came forward to answer Gruppe and, as Teufel believed (*op. cit.* 380), to make the identification with Ovid forever impossible. He apparently believed that the *Heroides*, which stood first in the older editions, were the earliest works of Ovid. Naturally he experienced little difficulty in showing that these poems consist almost entirely of dactyls,¹² and

¹¹ Of course every classical scholar must entertain the kindest feeling and the greatest respect for the famous translator of the *Odyssey* and of the *Georgics*, but no account of the Lygdamus controversy can be intelligible which fails to bring out strongly Voss's violent prejudices and his scurrilous language. Fuss, *op. cit.* 54, cites numerous examples of the latter, and protests earnestly against such unfair methods of controversy. It appears to the present writer, however, that greater blame attaches to Voss's obsequious followers than to Voss himself. For Voss was a privileged character as a man of genius who had a distinct point of view — the simple life and the return to nature. Many of the scholars, however, who have been content to take their criticism at second hand from Voss, have no special point of view and no excuse that seems valid.

¹² "In his versification Ovid skips and dances, so that his hexameter, even

show an excessive accumulation of rhetorical effects. Therefore, he concludes, the Lygdamus elegies, which are written in spondees and in a natural style, cannot possibly be the work of Ovid. With the recklessness which Plessis has justly noted, he adds: "These characteristics of the metre are precisely those which stand out most sharply in youth." The truth is just the reverse, and Hultgren correctly lays down the rule that the more the poet advances towards the prime of life, the more the proportion of dactyls and of dactylic beginnings increases.¹³

The majority of careful students, be it said to their credit, have never accepted the prejudiced views of Voss: thus the elegies have been vigorously defended by Spohn (1819), by Golbéry, the Lemaire editor (1826), by Fuss (1867), and by Cranstoun, the English translator (1872). Much more moderate views are also to be found in Cruttwell (1877), Ribbeck (1889), and Sellar (1892). Finally, Plessis, in his *Poésie Latine* (1909), in the chapter devoted to Lygdamus (pp. 361-376), has at once paid a beautiful tribute to the genuine merits of these elegies and given a noble exemplification of the true critic's art. In his view, they proceed from a youthful poet of rare and brilliant genius, whose native generosity and tenderness of feeling have not yet been spoiled by contact with the corruptions of the world.

Gruppe had made it probable that the Lygdamus elegies are the work of Ovid, but he had not proved it. This proof was, however, definitely rendered by S. Kleemann (1876), who, in an elaborate dissertation, with the help of Burman's in the more serious poems (*Tristia* and *Fasti*), has nothing but dactyls in almost a half of the verses" (*Hallische Jahrbücher* 1 [1839], 1024 ff., quoted by Teuffel, *op. cit.* 380 ff., and by Kleemann, *op. cit.* 42 ff.).

¹³ *Op. cit.* 29: "Hexametri Ovidiani illustria exempla sunt, quae docent eo magis crescere numerum dactylorum, quo magis ipse in arte procedat. . . . Dubitari amplius nequit, quin poetarum elegiacorum poemata, minus dactylice in principio distichi constructa, inter opera iuvenilis aetatis referenda, carmina autem cum plurimis initiis dactylicis florenti aetati adnumeranda sint." Kleemann, *op. cit.* 29, justly lays down the same canon for Tibullus: "arte erudita in hexametris dactylus crebrior fit."

Index, examined the language minutely and pronounced it wholly Ovidian. It should be added that Kleemann used only a part of the available material from the Index and the Ovidian corpus — perhaps not more than one-half — but even this, in my judgment, is far more than is strictly necessary for purposes of valid proof. Kleemann's study was much praised by the reviewers, but otherwise it has received little attention.¹⁴ The reasons for this neglect are not far to seek. Many scholars had accepted without question and without independent study the distorted views of Voss which came to them in a slightly diluted form through the voluminous commentary of Disson; others lay entrenched in fancied security behind the barrier of the metre which Hertzberg had so conveniently and so confidently provided. Strangely enough, the Index to Ovid remained practically a closed book.

As soon as the Burman Index is used, the whole Messalla Appendix is seen to be unmistakably the work of the youthful Ovid, *aetate* eighteen to twenty-four.¹⁵ There is complete identity of vocabulary, and all the most characteristic Ovidianisms are in the Appendix, except only those which were developed later for the sake of the virtuosity and which are conveniently enumerated by Eschenburg. The evidence which is drawn merely from repeated tags and half-verses, without distinctive peculiarity of usage, is of course inconclusive for an author like Ovid who borrows so freely from contemporary poets, but the proof that rests upon the plainest and simplest idioms often recurring is one that scarcely admits of doubt or question. The Lygdamus poems, com-

¹⁴ An honorable exception is Professor K. P. Harrington's scholarly edition of the Roman elegiac poets (Selections, 1914). Professor Harrington comments on the possible identity of Ovid and Lygdamus with complete candor and with an open mind, although he does not commit himself definitely (Introd. 36).

¹⁵ In justice to myself, it is only fair to state that I reached my conclusions as to the identity of Lygdamus and Ovid at a time when I was acquainted neither with Gruppe's results nor with those of Kleemann and Ehrengruber, but was obliged to rely upon the simple text of Ovid and Eichert's lexicon to the *Metamorphoses* (Hanover, 1886).

posed at eighteen or nineteen, contain about ninety specific and striking Ovidianisms; Kleemann gives about half of these. The Panegyric upon Messalla contains probably more than a hundred Ovidianisms; Ehrenguber has already called attention to all of these, and in order to explain their occurrence, has propounded the ingenious theory that the Panegyric was a school exercise composed in a later age by some pupil of the rhetoricians who had access to all the works of Ovid and pilfered most freely from them all.¹⁶ Next, as the metre shows, come the six little letters of Sulpicia, the kinswoman of Messalla, in which this lady (with Ovid's sympathetic assistance) undertakes the part of wooing the shy youth, Cerinthus; they contain more than twelve Ovidianisms. About 21 B.C., *aetate* twenty-two, Ovid composed the five charming elegies giving in fuller form the story of the same pair of happy lovers, Sulpicia and Cerinthus; they show more than forty Ovidianisms and 47.4% of dactyls, thus approaching closely to the proportion of the first *Amores* (about 48.5%). The exquisite imitation of Tibullus, *Nulla tuum nobis* (IV, 13), that closes the collection, has ten Ovidianisms. Since Ovid edits the unfinished second book, the two spondaic elegies, with Ovidian language and thought, are in all probability his work, and can no longer be ascribed to Tibullus either in whole or in part. The poem in honor of Messalinus (II, 5) has, in fact, long occasioned difficulty, and has been known for nearly a century as the 'suspected elegy.' The other Ovidian elegy, II, 2, is evidently a continuation of the Sulpicia group, and celebrates the birthday of the shy but sorely smitten lover Cerinthus, who is now happily married to Sulpicia and is therefore given his true name of Cornutus. This poem is rightly assigned to the 'fourth book' by Gruppe.

The conclusions which we have reached upon grounds of language and metre are supported also by strong external

¹⁶ *Op. cit.* x, 71; II, 28; III, 80, etc. This treatise of more than 700 pages in all is a magnificent collection of material and, in spite of its technically erroneous conclusion, is truly a masterly piece of work.

evidence. Thus in the letters of the exile Ovid refers in unmistakable terms to the issuance of the Appendix, when he writes that it was Messalla who first induced him to venture upon the publication of his works.¹⁷ He mentions expressly the epicedion which he had composed upon the death of his patron and which was sung in the forum (*Pont.* I, 7, 29 ff.), but he also refers again and again to poems which he had composed in Messalla's honor in his early youth. Thus he writes that not even the eldest son, Messalinus, can remember the time when he "first began to venerate Messalla" (*Pont.* II, 3, 79 ff.). This last statement scarcely applies, I think, to our *Panegyric*, but can be more fitly referred to an earlier eulogy which we fortunately still possess—I mean *Catalepton* IX (XI), contained in the Appendix Vergiliana, a poem which celebrates Messalla's triumph over Aquitania, and which was therefore written in the year 27 B.C. Ribbeck, *Appendix Vergil.* Proleg. 12, and *Gesch. d. röm. Dicht.* II, 200, has already, on stylistic and metrical grounds, identified the author of this elegy with 'Lygdamus,' and both Marx (Pauly-Wissowa, I, 1326, s. v. *Albius*) and Schanz, *op. cit.* § 282, p. 233, speak approvingly of this view. I find on examination that these judgments are strongly supported by the language of the poem, and this elegy may therefore be confidently regarded as the earliest extant work of Ovid, written in his seventeenth year; in fact, in a brief monograph and admirable commentary which was published some years ago, but has just come into my hands at the moment of writing (*De Ovidio elegiac in Messallam auctore*, Budapest, 1909), Némethy, I find, has already clearly perceived and, in large measure, convincingly demonstrated the Ovidian authorship of the *Catalepton*. Messalinus, the eldest son, quindecimvir 10 B.C., consul 3 B.C., was probably born about 38-36 B.C., and can therefore scarcely have been more than ten years of age when this eulogy was composed.

I have not yet spoken of the date of the second eulogy

¹⁷ *Pont.* II, 3, 75 ff. (addressed to Cotta, the younger son).

which we possess, namely, the elaborate *Panegyric* of the Messalla Collection. This brilliant and highly rhetorical work is metrically more advanced than the Lygdamus elegies and was certainly composed at a later date than these poems. Undoubtedly, by an ingenious literary or artistic fiction, the *Panegyric* itself purports to be written in the year of Messalla's consulship, 31 B.C., and the events of the years 30-27 B.C., namely, the expeditions to Aquitania and the Orient, which had already been expressly celebrated by Tibullus (I, 7) and by the youthful Ovid (*Catalepton*, IX), are nowhere mentioned as having actually occurred. Special students of the *Panegyric*, however, have long seen that the Gallic and Egyptian campaigns are well known to the clever writer, and are most skilfully introduced into the poem by way of prophecy (*ratificinium ex eventu*).¹⁸ The *Panegyric* was therefore composed after the Lygdamus elegies, and the first draft of the poem must have been drawn up about the year 23 B.C.; it treats chiefly the earlier career of Messalla, which had not previously been made the subject of poetic encomium. We are not at present fully in a position to state how Ovid was occupied in the interval between the composition of the Lygdamus poems and the *Panegyric*. It is true that H. de la Ville de Mirmont confidently assumes (*Jeunesse d'Ovide*, 209) that it was shortly after the two early marriages and about his twentieth year that our poet visited Asia Minor and Sicily in the suite of the poet Macer, and at first glance the *Panegyric* also, in its present revised and perfected form, appears to contain probable or possible references to Sicily (vss. 197, 200). We must carefully refrain, however, from drawing hasty conclusions at present and must frankly admit that we cannot at once determine the exact date of the year which Ovid spent with Macer in Asia and Sicily (*Pont.* II. 10. 21 ff.).

A brief word must be said, however, upon Ovid's relation to the *Ciris* (the legend of Scylla and Nisus) in the Appendix

¹⁸ See Hartung, *op. cit.* 38 ff.; Ehrengreuber, *op. cit.* I, 7; X, 71; also Belling, *Albius Tibullus: Untersuchung*, 205 ff.

Vergiliana. As is well known, this poem offers special peculiarities and difficulties. Besides being partly a translation from Greek sources, it everywhere closely follows the manner of Catullus and, owing to the poet's prodigious memory, in many passages it presents almost the appearance of a cento compiled from Catullus and Vergil. It was composed after the publication of the complete *Aeneid* (19 B.C.), the whole of which it imitates. The agreement therefore of the *Ciris* with the usual Ovidian vocabulary is not quite so close as we find in the other juvenile works, yet it is sufficient, I believe, easily and conclusively to establish Ovidian authorship, especially when we consider that, by a species of *κένωσις* and in a purely temporary stage of his art, the poet has divested himself of a part at least of his usual and natural manner. Certain it is that the situation described in the poem suits Ovid and Ovid alone. The work is addressed (vss. 36 and 54) to the young "Messalla," by whom Messalinus is evidently meant. The writer definitely renounces (vss. 1-2) the public career to which he had formerly devoted himself and of which he has now grown weary, but there is not a word in the poem to warrant the usual assumption that the author was a man of advanced years who had reached the age of forty-five or fifty.¹⁹ On the contrary, the situation is precisely that described in *Trist.* iv, 10, 33-40, *i.e.*, the author has held certain minor offices in the *cursus honorum* and now refuses to go further in the pursuit of public honors. Hence no one who has followed the career of Ovid with genuine interest can read the opening lines of the *Ciris* without some thrill of emotion.²⁰ Refusing to become a candidate for the quaestorship and the senatorial rank at the age of twenty-

¹⁹ Teuffel-Schwabe, *Hist. of Rom. Lit.*, Eng. trans. § 230, 2, 1; Ribbeck, *Gesch. d. röm. Dicht.* II, 355; Schanz, *op. cit.* § 241.

²⁰ Propertius also (III, 21, 25 ff.) finely pictures himself as a student at Athens in the school of Plato or the garden of Epicurus, but the scene is probably an imaginary one. At a more youthful age and with less experience of the world, Horace too visited Athens and "sought for truth amid the groves of the Academy" (*Epist.* II, 2, 45).

six, the poet whose influence upon subsequent European literature was to be so vast, hastens to Athens,²¹ the "fair garden of Cecrops,"²² and the true home of the intellectual life, in order to drink, at the fountain source, of the ever-living waters, and to worship at the shrine of the world's four great Teachers.²³ With the over-sanguine temperament of youth, he even dreams of composing at some future time a great epic upon nature and the creation that shall rival the sublime and majestic work of Lucretius.²⁴ The *Ciris* is to be placed then about the middle of Ovid's spondaic period; it precedes the first *Amores* and also three or four other works belonging to the *carmina iuvenalia*.

II. Transition from Sulpicia Elegies to *Amores*. Spondaic Character of First *Amores*

The percentage of dactyls and of dactylic beginnings which the juvenile poems of Ovid exhibit may be seen in a summary form from the table below. In the case of elegiac verse the percentage is here given for the whole distich, that is, it has been obtained by combining the first four feet of the hexameter and the first two feet of the pentameter; in the case of epic verse, the percentage is for the first four feet of the hexameter. In the Lygdamus elegies, since the style of the youthful poet is still imperfectly formed and he vacillates between two proportions, I give the six Lygdamus elegies first as a whole and secondly as forming two groups. It will be found that the second group (4 and 5) gives results almost

²¹ *Trist.* I, 2, 77: nec peto, quas quondam petii studiosus, Athenas.

²² *Etsi me vario iactatum laudis amore*

Irritaque expertum fallacis praemia vulgi

Cecropius suavis exspirans hortulus auras

Florentis viridi sophiae complectitur umbra. — *Ciris*, 1-4.

²³ Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, and Epicurus; cf. *Ciris*, 15: sapientia . . . quatuor antiquis heredibus edita consors.

²⁴ *Ciris*, 12-41. The plan was later fulfilled probably in the *Aetna* (the language of which I have not yet examined in all its details) and in the proemium and fifteenth book of the *Metamorphoses*, also perhaps in the lost *Phaenomena* and in parts of the *Fasti*.

identical with the Sulpicia letters. The figures for the *Panegyric* and the *Ciris* are those of Ehrenguber (*op. cit.* x, 5 and 21). The *Aetna*, which, according to every probability, is also the work of Ovid, is omitted from the comparison only because the exact figures are not accessible to me at the present writing; its proportions are, however, not very different from those of the *Ciris*. There appears to be conclusive evidence for including also the *Culex*, though I was long prevented from examining the language of this poem by erroneous impressions that I had at first formed respecting the treatment of the caesura in this work. Finally, Pliny, *N.H.* xxxii, 152, was wholly mistaken in his conjecture ("fortassis") that the *Halieutica* relates to the "fish of the Black Sea" and was consequently written at the close of the poet's life; the *schemata* show conclusively that the poem, wholly dependent as it is upon Greek books, belongs to the Lygdamus and Sulpicia period.

THE JUVENILE WORKS OF OVID

	Catalept. IX. 62 vss.	Halieut. 130 hex.	Lygdamus, all six elegies. ²⁵ 290 vss.	Lygdamus, four elegies, 1, 2, 3, 6. 160 vss.	Lygdamus, two elegies, 4, 5. 130 vss.	Sulpicia Letters, IV, 7-12. 40 vss.
SS. Dact. ²⁶	53 44.8	222 42.8	350 41.3	216 45.0	144 36.9	45 37.5
SS. Spond.	75 55.2	208 57.2	511 58.7	264 55.0	240 63.1	75 62.5
I. ²⁷ Dact.	46 71.6	62 47.7	166 57.2	101 63.1	65 50.0	20 50.0
I. Spond.	18 28.1	68 52.3	124 42.8	59 36.0	65 50.0	20 50.0

	Sulpicia Elegies, IV, 2-6; also IV, 13-14. 142 vss.	Cornutus Elegy, [Tib.] II, 2. 22 vss.	Messalinus, Elegy, [Tib.] II, 5. 122 vss.	Panegyric. 211 hex.	Ciris. 527 hex.	Culex. 410 hex.
SS. Dact.	202 47.4	33 50.0	171 46.7	370 44.9	916 43.5	781 47.6
SS. Spond.	224 52.6	33 50.0	105 53.3	405 55.1	1102 56.5	850 52.4
I. Dact.	09 60.7	18 81.8	05 77.8	143 67.7	352 66.8	275 67.1
I. Spond.	43 30.3	4 18.2	27 22.2	68 32.3	175 33.2	135 32.9

²⁵ The figures are from Kleemann, *op. cit.* 29 f.²⁶ Summa dactylorum.²⁷ First foot.

A few words of explanation may be added to the tabular statement. Ovid began in *Catalepton*, ix with a proportion of dactyls which was wholly normal in the year 27 B.C. Thus he has 44.8% in the whole distich, which is as good as the second and third books of Propertius,²⁸ as good also as the eighth and third elegies of Tibullus' first book.²⁹ Yet he has no limitations whatever in *Catalepton*, ix upon polysyllabic endings in the pentameter; on the contrary, like Catullus and like Propertius in his earlier work, he fairly revels in their use (50%). In the Lygdamus elegies, however, and in the Sulpicia letters, the ambitious and aspiring youth seeks suddenly to pass from the longer endings to the more elegant dissyllables of Tibullus, and is evidently preoccupied with this problem and its difficulties. Under these conditions throughout the Lygdamus poems he wavers greatly in his composition, and, in one hundred and seventy verses (Lygd. 4 and 5, [Tib.] iv, 7-12), he even sinks to the proportion of Catullus, namely, about 37% in the distich, and to only 50% of dactylic beginnings.³⁰ This is of course excellent Latin elegy, but it is not the kind that was most in vogue in 24 B.C.³¹ It is only in the qualified or limited sense just ex-

²⁸ Propertius has 44.8% and 44.7% in the second and third books respectively. My figures are taken from Hultgren, *op. cit.* 23, who follows the five-book division of Propertius.

²⁹ Tibullus has 44.8% in the eighth elegy (Pholoe) for the whole distich and 45% in the third elegy. It is scarcely fanciful to see in the decline of dactyls in the third elegy an expression of Tibullus' sadness and depression of feeling during his illness at Corcyra; we have the same phenomenon in Lygdamus' fifth elegy. My figures are taken from Cartault, *Le distique élégiaque chez Tibulle, Sulpicia, Lygdamus* (Paris, 1911), 7.

³⁰ Figures for Catullus are given by Hultgren, *op. cit.* 15 ff. Catullus has usually 58% to 60% of dactylic beginnings, but in *Carm.* 60-110 (310 vs.) he has 36.6% of dactyls in the distich and only 47% of dactylic beginnings.

³¹ Catullus wrote some of the best Latin elegy, and the naturalness and directness of his style is due in part to his not exceeding the proportion named. As I have shown in my "Licensed Feet in Latin Verse," *op. cit.* 251-272, even the best Latin poets, such as Catullus and Horace, experience some difficulty in always providing one *required* dactyl, and *therefore* they occasionally admit without metrical ambiguity in such a foot exceptional or vulgar shortenings and even *short vowels* (without m) in *hiatus*, as Lucilius, ix, 243 Bähr.,

plained that Ovid can be said to have ever been a disciple of Catullus in the matter of dactylic proportions, but undoubtedly in his youth he paid this brief tribute to the freer and more natural style of his great predecessor. A secondary cause for the low proportion may perhaps be found in the sad and almost despairing character of the two elegies.

It will be noted that Ovid advanced in the Sulpicia and Messalinus poems which are composed in the elegiac metre to about 47% of dactyls in the whole distich; the hexameter lines alone of these poems show 46.1% and 45.9% respectively. On the other hand, the hexameters of purely epic poems like the *Ciris* fall back to 43.5%, which is normal for epic verse

o⁵re cōrupto (necessary dactyl of the hexameter); Lucr. vi, 1133, natu⁵ra cōruptum; Cat. 10, 26, istos cōmodā; nām volo ād Sarāpim (necessary dactyl of the Phalaecean); Hor. Carm. iii, 14, 11, iām virum expertāe, malē ōminātis (short vowel in hiatus, necessary dactyl of the Sapphic); Pers. 3, 66, dīscitē, ō miseri (license of the first foot, with greatly preferred dactyl); Luxorius, 302, 4, magnum depre⁵nderē usum. If difficulty is experienced in supplying one required dactyl for the Sapphic or the hexameter, it is clear that two necessary dactyls, as in the pentameter, constitute a very exacting demand upon the Roman language, and if the virtuosity is also insisted upon, a very elegant but very artificial form of verse is the result. For example, for metrical reasons, Ovid (like Tibullus) constantly uses *ab arte* and similar phrases drawn from the vulgar language, with its analytical tendency, instead of the simple ablative, and he also uses, by poetic license, to an unparalleled extent, the simple ablative for the ablative of the agent with *ab*, as *Her.* 4, 64, cāptā parēntē sorōr, 'my sister was captivated by your parent,' where neither *parenti* nor a *parente* could enter the verse; upon the whole subject see in part Guttman, *Sogenannte instrumentales ab bei Ovid*, Dortmund, 1890. I was mistaken therefore in my former discussion (p. 271) in thinking that Ovid had perhaps actually used the spelling *parente* for the dative *parenti*, as he so often uses *mare* and *caeleste* for *marī* and *caelesti*, and as Statius, *Silv.* iv, 2, 28, uses *glaucae* certantia *Do⁵ridē* saxa, and Propertius, v (iv), 8, 10, writes cum temere anguino creditur o⁵rē manus (Neue-Wagener, *Formenlehre*, 1³, 301). The honest 37% of Catullus and Lygdamus does not compel a resort to such unusual constructions, and is therefore by no means to be despised. Dissen and Postgate (*Selections from Tibullus*, p. xliii), on purely subjective grounds and without consulting indices, lexicons, or Latin authors, have discovered that Lygdamus is an author of "poor Latinity." On the contrary, his Latinity is more natural and in some respects better than that of the mature Ovid. Yet even the latter — like Euripides, an unrivalled master of the graceful and pleasing forensic style — could give most of us lessons in correct Latinity to our great and lasting profit.

and almost precisely the proportion of Vergil. In fact that strange and anomalous thing, the actual preponderance of dactyls in a Latin epic poem, could never by any possibility arise in the more vigorous epic hexameter (*versus fortis* or *gravis*); it must appear first in the soft and tender strains of the elegy (*versus mollis* or *levis*), and may be transferred thence to epic verse, as Ovid transferred it in the *Metamorphoses* and Valerius Flaccus later employed it in imitation of Ovid. Even Ovid in his mature period has recognized this difference to some extent; for the hexameter of elegy in the *Heroides* (first series) reaches 56.4%, while the epic hexameter of the *Metamorphoses* does not exceed 54.8%.

It is evident then that in the first edition of the *Amores* which was published in 14 B.C.,³² only a few years after the Sulpicia elegies, the *Ciris*, and the *Aetna*, Ovid had had little opportunity to develop a marked dactylic virtuosity and to become a highly artistic elegiac poet. We may be sure then that the first *Amores* of 14 B.C. showed only a very moderate advance upon the 47.4% of the Sulpicia elegies, and they may even have contained, like the latter, a few polysyllabic endings in the pentameter. Up to 14 B.C. Ovid was in fact fully as much an epic as an elegiac poet (see *Am.* I, 1, 1-18 on his early ambition to excel in epic themes), and he was still far from having attained in the Sulpicia poems the high virtuosity which appears in three of the four genuine elegies of Tibullus' second book, namely, 55% or more.³³ Two of the short Sulpicia elegies and the equally short Cornutus poem show, it is true, an equal or a superior number of dactyls,³⁴ but four Sulpicia poems and the long Messalinus elegy

³² Schanz, *op. cit.* 270 (§ 293), suggests that these elegies probably came first separately before the public, but later were collected in the edition of 14 B.C. This seems quite probable, especially as the spondaic *Amores* show in general the predominance of the same *schemata* or figures of the hexameter as the Sulpicia and Messalinus poems.

³³ The first elegy of the second book has 55.2% in the distich, the third has 50%, the fourth 55%, and the sixth 56.8%; see the figures of Cartault, *op. cit.* 7, and Ehrenguber, *op. cit.* x, 5.

³⁴ IV, 6 (20 vss.) has 50% of dactyls; IV, 5 (20 vss.) 58.3%; II, 2 (20 vss.) 50%.

(11, 5) have a decided preponderance of spondees. A marked change in Ovid's whole attitude took place, however, after 14 B.C. For unlike the *Ciris* and the *Aetna*, which did not greatly increase their author's reputation, the *Amores*, immediately upon their first publication, achieved a prodigious success; they at once became popular favorites, and, like the *Eclogues* of Vergil, were frequently sung in the theatre with accompanying dance (*Trist.* 11, 519; v, 7, 25). The favorable reception thus accorded to the elegies naturally determined the direction of the poet's genius and led him to devote himself uninterruptedly (with the exception of the tragedy of *Medea*) for sixteen years (14 B.C. to 2 A.D.) to the perfection of an elegiac style which surpassed even the later work of Tibullus.

Having developed a remarkable and distinctive technique in the *Heroides* and the *Ars*, Ovid resolved to make the first *Amores* conform fully to his later rules of art. The revision was not due to the fact that this popular and successful work was poetically immature, nor even chiefly to the desire to add a series of new elegies; as he himself tells us in the prefixed epigram, the question was primarily one of more careful finish and elaboration: "hoc illi praetulit auctor opus" (cf. Gruppe, *op. cit.* 377). In brief, his principal purpose was to eliminate all polysyllabic endings, to introduce everywhere the full dactylic virtuosity, to multiply the dactylic beginnings, and to remove or greatly reduce those *schemata*, such as *DSSS*, *SDSS*, *SSSS*, *SS*, *SD*, and the like, which were no longer fully acceptable. The view adopted by Heuwer in his discussion of the matter (*op. cit.* 31) is that the revision "consisted in here and there substituting a word that was more suitable for one that was less suitable to the metre and sense, or in changing the collocation of words or verses, or in doing all these things at the same time." These conclusions are partly correct, but there can be no doubt that both the additions and the alterations were far more extensive and thoroughgoing than Heuwer supposes. The first edition

was in fact subjected to a drastic revision and was almost entirely rewritten in conformity to the new rules of art.³⁵

Nevertheless abundant traces of the character of the first edition still remain; for in not a few cases the poet has triumphed over the versifier and the artist, and a number of the original poems of the first edition have been retained with very moderate changes. This fact may be shown very clearly in two ways, if the writer correctly understands the true nature of Ovidian versification. For the full and harmoniously developed virtuosity in the Ovidian sense means first that there shall be a considerable preponderance of dactyls in the distich taken as a whole, and secondly that there shall be a similar preponderance of dactyls in each member taken singly, that is, in both the hexameter and the pentameter lines. It is evident therefore that virtuosity is lacking in the *Amores* in two ways: (1) when the spondees are either equal or predominant in the whole distich; (2) when they are equal or predominant in the hexameter line (*versus fortis* or *durus*) alone. With this understanding of the nature of virtuosity, I may summarize the facts briefly as follows. A considerable part of the second edition is entirely new and consists of such newly written elegies as II, 17 and 18; III, 1 and 15; and also the last 18 lines of III, 9 (the epicedion upon Tibullus).³⁶ A still larger part has been completely or almost completely revised in order to bring the elegies up to practically the same virtuosity as the

³⁵ The extraordinary importance which the mature Ovid attached to formal polish and elegance is not only evident from the exacting rules which he strictly observes, but also from his own express statements. Thus he speaks of destroying many works which would have won popular favor, but which he himself considered "faulty" (*vitiosa*, *Trist.* IV, 10, 61), he often laments that the poems of the exile are composed with less care and skill than was his wont (*Pont.* I, 5, 15 ff.: 57 ff.), and he bitterly complains that the *Metamorphoses* were uncorrected and lacked the finishing touches at the moment of his banishment, as in *Trist.* III, 14, 21, *illud opus . . . nunc incorrectum populi pervenit in ora*. See also *ib.* I, 7, 27 ff., *defuit et scriptis ultima lima meis*; I, 7, 39 ff.: II, 555.

³⁶ On the new elegies, see also Schanz, *op. cit.* 270 (§ 293).

Ars or the *Heroides* (first series), namely, 57% in the distich;³⁷ about a fourth part of the whole edition, however, shows only slight and moderate changes from its original form. That is, of the forty-nine elegies,³⁸ fourteen have been only partially and imperfectly revised. A single poem of 66 verses (III, 8) remains at practically the same average as the Sulpicia elegies, namely, 47.98% of dactyls in the distich; four other poems, however, of 184 verses (I, 2. 13. 15; III, 10) remain with the dactyls subordinate in the hexameter line, and either equal (only 50%) or subordinate (49.23%) in the whole distich. Five elegies (I, 14;³⁹ II, 4. 8. 11; III, 3), of 236 verses, also remain with the dactyls either subordinate or equal in the hexameter line, and with 52.4, 50.7, 51.2, 50.6, 50.7% respectively in the whole distich. Two elegies (II, 12. 14) of 72 verses, show a weak pentameter and only 51.2 and 52.3% in the distich; two other elegies (III, 14 and the first three-fourths of III, 9, the epicedion on Tibullus, composed in 19 B.C.), with 100 verses, are also low in their proportion of dactyls, namely, 53.3 and 51.3%. Furthermore, very largely the same identical *schemata* are predominant in all these elegies as we find preferred in the Sulpicia elegies (IV, 2-6) and in the imitation of Tibullus (IV, 13). Thus fourteen elegies of 658 verses — more than one-fourth of the total number — conspicuously lack the virtuosity; among these are included some of the most notable poems in the collection, such as I, 2 (the poet's willing submission to Love), I, 13 (Aurora and Tithonus), I, 14 (Corinna's use of dyes), I, 15 (epilogue on the immortality of poesy), II, 4 (reasons for love), II, 11 (lament over Corinna's voyage),

³⁷ 56.9% in the *Ars* (Drobisch), and 57.6% in the *Heroides*.

³⁸ There are really fifty elegies, as Gruppe, *op. cit.* 377, first pointed out, and as Ehwald, the latest editor, obtains, by breaking up II, 9 into two poems. In order, however, to avoid confusion and to be uniform with the results of Hultgren and Drobisch, my statistics (like theirs) are everywhere based upon the edition of Merkel, Leipzig, 1887.

³⁹ This is the poem which, through its reference to the subjugation of the Sigambri (15 B.C.), dates the whole original collection.

II, 12 (Corinna's surrender), II, 14 (the evils of abortion, with several Lygdamus verses repeated), III, 3 (Corinna's perjuries unpunished), III, 9 (epicedion on Tibullus, 50 out of 68 verses), III, 14 (Corinna's infidelities best unknown). The percentage of the nine 'imperfect' elegies of Books I and III is 50.5% of dactyls for the whole distich, of the five 'imperfect' elegies of Book II, 51.1%, and the difference between the perfect and the imperfect parts of the second *Amores* is 6% for the four poems of Book I, 5.3% for the five of Book II, and 4.8% for the five of Book III.⁴⁰ I think it quite reasonable, however, to assume that, even in the case of the imperfect elegies, at least 2.3% of dactyls have been added in the revision, and I thus reach the conclusion that the percentage of the first *Amores* did not exceed 48.5% of dactyls for the whole distich, and therefore rose only slightly above the 47.4% of the Sulpicia elegies and of IV, 13-14.

Though less important than the sum of the dactyls, the proportion of dactylic beginnings also requires mention. The percentage of dactylic beginnings in both hexameter and pentameter in *Am. I* is 80; in the four imperfect elegies (I, 2. 13. 14. 15) it is 73.4, in the remainder of the book it is 82.2, thus giving a difference of 8.8% between the two parts. We may consider as normal for the mature Ovid the percentage in both hexameter and pentameter of the *Ars*, which is 82.3, or that of the *Fasti*, which is 84.2. Similarly the percentage of dactylic beginnings in the whole of *Am. II* is 78.6; in the five imperfect elegies (II, 4. 8. 11. 12. 14)⁴¹ it is 71.6, in the remainder of the book it is 80.9, giving a difference of 9.3% between the two parts. With these five elegies of *Am. II* we may fitly compare not only the percentage of the Sulpicia elegies (IV, 2-6) and IV, 13-14, which is 69.7% in 142 verses, but also that of the early *Medicamen Faciei* frag-

⁴⁰ In the case of III, 9, the Tibullus epicedion, only the first 50 verses out of 68 are used.

⁴¹ II, 9 is also spondaic if we cut out the six verses (23-28) which Ovid seems to have added in the second edition in order to join the originally separate poems 9 and 9 B.

ment of 100 verses, which is 70, while its percentage of dactyls for the distich is also low, namely, 53.5.⁴² The percentage of dactylic beginnings in the whole of *Am.* III is 77.1; in the four imperfect elegies (III, 8. 10. 14, first 50 vs. of 9) it is 74. in the remainder of the book it is 78.5, giving a difference of 4.5 between the two parts. I consider this brief summary of usage affecting the first foot sufficient for the practical purposes of the present study, and in my subsequent discussion shall purposely omit this feature of the single elegies from the tabular statements. I may add, however, that the percentage of dactyls in the first foot in *Catalepton.* IX is 71.9; owing to preoccupation with the dissyllabic close and to imitation of Catullus, it sinks in the Lygdamus elegies to 55.8⁴³ and in the Sulpicia letters (IV, 7-12. 40 verses) to 50; it rises again to 67.7 in the *Panegyric*, 66.8 in the *Ciris*, and 57.1 in the *Culex*.⁴⁴

⁴² Hultgren, *op. cit.* 28 ff., argues that no importance should be attached to so small a fragment, yet at the same time (pp. 32 f.) shows the greatest uneasiness because of its evidence, apparently fearing that it may bring to naught the whole elaborate fabric of Ovidian virtuosity. One wonders what he would have thought if he had examined the single *Amores*.

⁴³ It varies greatly in single Lygdamus elegies from 82.2, 61.8, and 65.7 in 1, 5, and 6 to 53.4, 55.2, and 45.8 in 2, 3, and 4. In the technical *Halieutica* it sinks also to 47.7.

⁴⁴ On account of the length of the article it has been found necessary to omit here five tables giving exact statistics for the fourteen elegies. Two articles, which continue the present study and treat the language and *schemata* of Book IV of the Tibulline Corpus, will be published shortly in the *American Journal of Philology*.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES

THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

This book is **DUE** on the last date stamped

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

A 001 410 597 7